## United States Court of Appeals

•	For the Eighth Circuit	
	No. 14-1736	
U	Inited States of America	
	Plaintiff - Appellee	?
	V.	
Noi	rberto A. Dangla-Sanchez	
	Defendant - Appella	nt
	rom United States District Corn District of Missouri - Kan	
	mitted: November 4, 2014 iled: November 7, 2014 [Unpublished]	
Before WOLLMAN, BYE, and	d SMITH, Circuit Judges.	
PER CURIAM.		
Norberto Dangla-Sanche and the district court <sup>1</sup> sentenced	ez directly appeals after he plo	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Brian C. Wimes, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

range. His counsel has moved to withdraw, and has filed a brief under <u>Anders v. California</u>, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), acknowledging an appeal waiver in Dangla-Sanchez's plea agreement, questioning the reasonableness of the sentence imposed, and raising a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel.

To begin, we decline to consider counsel's ineffective-assistance claim on direct appeal. See United States v. McAdory, 501 F.3d 868, 872-73 (8th Cir. 2007) (ineffective-assistance claims are ordinarily deferred to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 proceedings). As to counsel's challenge to the reasonableness of the sentence, we enforce the appeal waiver. See United States v. Andis, 333 F.3d 886, 889-92 (8th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (court should enforce appeal waiver and dismiss appeal where it falls within scope of waiver, plea agreement and waiver were entered into knowingly and voluntarily, and no miscarriage of justice would result); see also United States v. Scott, 627 F.3d 702, 704 (8th Cir. 2010) (de novo review of validity and applicability of appeal waiver). Finally, having reviewed the record independently under Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we find no non-frivolous issues outside the scope of the appeal waiver. Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal based upon the appeal waiver, and we grant counsel leave to withdraw.

-2-